

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession---everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 33.

RICHMOND, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

THE CRISIS will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1—and no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. We mean to make no debts at all. We abjure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

POLITICAL.

MR. VAN BUREN—and the War.

Mr. Rives shows his usual magnanimity, either in misrepresenting every act of Mr. Van Buren, or in ascribing it to a bad motive. In this spirit, he has charged upon him (in the Tippecanoe Clubs and log cabins) that he was originally against the War, but as soon as Mr. Madison was re-elected, he turned round to support the War. For this after-thought, the insidious diplomatist has no sort of evidence to produce, though he tries to harp upon his support of De Witt Clinton.—The whole attack is, however, in unison with Mr. Rives's present course. It is a miserable effort to extricate himself from the embarrassment of his having supported Mr. Van Buren in 1836.

Thanks to Mr. Griswold! His charge upon Mr. Van Buren is virtually abandoned. In a long article (which he has published in the R. Whig) Mr. G. makes the following confession:

"The advocates of Mr. Van Buren, feeling the necessity of discrediting what I have said, have labored to prove that I must be mistaken. As I was very young, (ten years old, Mr. P.) and as twenty-eight years have elapsed it is quite possible that I may be mistaken. This I have uniformly admitted."

We regret that it is out of our power to publish this long communication of Mr. G's, of which he has furnished us with a copy. But we have no space at this time to spare for a discussion which has run into a personal controversy between himself and Mr. John A. Parker—especially as he has gone unnecessarily out of his way to give us an illiberal hit. But thanks to Mr. Griswold! we repeat, for having drawn out Mr. Van Buren himself on this much agitated subject. What will his generous critics, and particularly the high-minded W. C. Rives say to the following correspondence?—We are indebted for a copy of it to John A. Parker, Esq., of Tappanhook:

(THE CORRESPONDENCE.)

MONTAGUE'S, Essex county, Va.,
June 1st, 1840.

To his Excellency MARTIN VAN BUREN,

President of the United States.

Sir:—You will find in my object, my apology for addressing you. Candor requires me to say that, politically, I am opposed to you, and that I have done, and am doing, all I can honestly do, to defeat your reelection. But I have never had any reason to doubt your integrity, as a man, or of your candor and honor as a gentleman. To these I now address myself.

In the course of the late canvass in this State, I charged, as an objection to you, that you had been opposed to Mr. Madison, and the war until after Nov. 1812; and as an evidence of it, stated that I had heard you, during the summer of 1812, in conversation with other persons, express your decided opposition to Mr. Madison and the war. Your friends, here, met this statement by the letters of Mr. Butler, Wright, &c., imputing to me, in terms, a defect of memory, but by implication, a want of personal veracity. So long as this was confined to the limited circle in which I am known, I disregarded it. But my attention having been two days ago called to an article, in the Richmond Enquirer of the 26th ultimo, republished from the Globe, in which the charge of falsehood is directly made against me, I feel impelled by a regard for my character to seek the means of relieving it from injurious imputations.—I do not know of any living witness (though there may be, for I have as yet taken no steps to ascertain) except yourself, who can sustain me in the declaration, and I appeal to you, in the confident belief, that you will permit no hostility as a politician to prevent you doing me justice as a man.

In 1812, I, then a boy, was boarding in Kingston, Ulster county, N. Y., and going to school at the Academy under the charge of the Rev. J. Munsell. During the summer, (and I think two or three times) you visited Kingston, and while there conversed freely upon the subject of National politics. In some of these conversations, one of which, if I mistake not, was held with Jesse Burd, then the Editor of a newspaper published in Kingston, called the "Plebeian," you spoke in decided terms of opposition to Mr. Madison and the war,

as I then understood you; and the recollection remains with me as distinctly as that of any other occurrence after so great a lapse of time.

Upon this recollection, I have said what I have said. If my memory has deceived me, or if I misunderstood your language, and have done you injustice, I shall take great pleasure in correcting the error so soon as apprised of it. For, although as decidedly opposed to you politically, as any man can be, I have never been willing to use any other than fair and honest means against you. If I understood you aright and my recollection is correct, then it is but simple justice to me that you should place in my power the means of defending my reputation.

I have, therefore, to ask, that you will, at your earliest leisure, reply to this letter, and say whether you did not during the summer of 1812, at Kingston, express your decided opposition to Mr. Madison and the war.

It is perhaps unnecessary, but I will add, that should your reply sustain my memory, it will not be used in any manner to operate upon the election in November next.

Mr. Hunter, Speaker of the H. of Representatives, and Representative in Congress from this District, knows who, and what I am, and to him, I beg leave to refer you for information with regard to my character.

With great personal respect,

I have the honor to be,

Your most obd't serv't.

C. G. GRISWOLD.

P. S. Let your reply be addressed to me by mail, to this place.

C. G. G.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 7th, 1840.

My dear Sir: Your letter of the 23d ult., enclosing an open one from your constituent Mr. Griswold, was by some accident mislaid, and found only a day or two since. Considering the circumstances under which Mr. G. has thought proper to promulgate a most unfounded imputation upon my public conduct, the course which he has pursued, his promise of political impunity if I will sanction his unfounded statements, and the scarcely disguised menace, that he will search for witnesses to prove it, if I do not so sanction it, I do not think it proper to enter into any correspondence with him upon the subject of his letter.

It is however right, that I should protect myself against any other inference that might be drawn from the adoption of this course by declaring, as I now do to you, through whose hands Mr. G's communication has passed, that he is entirely mistaken in supposing that he ever heard me say anything against the war. So far from expressing, I never for a moment harbored a feeling adverse either to its declaration, or to its vigorous prosecution after it was declared. What was done by me in favor of both, will appear from the public archives and the contemporaneous history of the country. All imputations, therefore, which attribute different sentiments to me, from whatever quarter they have proceeded, or may proceed, are grossly unfounded.

That I supported electors favorable to Mr. Clinton, has never been denied. The circumstances under which that support was given, and the considerations which led to it, have been unreservedly, repeatedly and authoritatively spread before the people by my friends. I am at the same time, for reasons which it is unnecessary to detail, as confident as one can be in such a matter, that Mr. Griswold is mistaken in the impressions he describes of a supposed conversation upon that subject at Kingston. The high opinions which I have nevertheless uniformly entertained of the purity, exalted patriotism, and eminent talents of Mr. Madison, are upon record, and in a form which has nothing to fear from the vituperation of the day.

Accept my thanks, sir, for the just and liberal spirit shown in your note, with assurances of the respect and esteem with which,

I am, very truly,

Your friend and obd't serv't.

M. VAN BUREN.

The Hon. R. M. T. HUNTER.

LOYDS, Essex cty., Aug. 15th, 1840.

I had the pleasure of receiving your letter in relation to that addressed to you through me, by Mr. Griswold. I was gratified to perceive that you understood the nature and extent of my agency in this transaction. I presume that there would be no impropriety in showing your letter, or giving it to the public, as justice to yourself may perhaps require it, should an appearance of

silence on your part be construed into an admission of the charge. In this matter, however, I desire to be guided entirely by your pleasure, and I would be obliged to you to inform me at your earliest leisure, whether your letter may be communicated to the public, or whether it is to be considered as private. I hope I need not add, that my sole end in thus troubling you again, is to be enabled to take that course with the letter, which may be most agreeable to yourself.

With friendly regards,

I am, your obd't serv't.

R. M. T. HUNTER.

To the President of the U. S., Washington, D. C.

My dear Sir: I have had the honor to receive your obliging letter of the 15th instant. I did not intend that mine to you should be regarded as private, but am entirely willing to have it shewn to any one. Although its publication was not contemplated at the time, I shall be well satisfied with that disposition of it, whenever such a case shall appear to you to have become necessary or proper.

Accept assurances of the sincere respect and esteem with which I am your friend and obd't serv't.

M. VAN BUREN.

The Hon. R. M. HUNTER.

Washington, August 19, 1840.

One word more! Mr. Van Buren's support of De Witt Clinton's nomination, is no evidence of his opposition to the war.—Mr. Clinton himself was in favor of the war—some of his friends thought, more strongly than Mr. Madison. It was but the other day, that we read his Speech in favor of the most decided measures—when he lashed its Federal opponents with the lash of a scorpion—and, characterizing their party, boldly pronounced in the Senate House, that, like Satan, they

—would rather rule in Hell,
Than serve in Heaven.

(From the Ohio Statesman.)

IS GENERAL HARRISON DERANGED?—BATTLE OF THE THAMES—COL. JOHNSON—MORE HISTORY—INDISPUTABLE FACTS.

Gen. Harrison is going from town to village, through Ohio, behaving like a pettish and blubbering child, making statements as much out of character for a candidate for the exalted post of President of 20 millions of intelligent freemen, as they are false and ridiculous. General Harrison might, with about the same propriety, say that he was in the "thickest and hardest of the fight" at Fort Stephenson, as that he rushed into the "front of the battle," "fool-like," in Colonel Johnson's "forlorn hope," when he attacked Tecumseh. If so, why did he not kill Tecumseh himself? We look next for Harrison to assert that he really did kill that "big Indian," and that it was the "horrible slanders" of his enemies that have so long withheld justice from the real hero! If Gen. Harrison's friends had one particle of common sense, they would take him home and keep him there. If they suppose the log-cabin trap, baited with hard cider and coon skins, has so debased the human mind that reason, memory, and every perception has been driven away, they are most emphatically mistaken.

The following appeared some two weeks since in the paper from which it is copied:

(From the Cincinnati Advertiser and Journal.)

We, the undersigned, were present at a meeting of the Whigs in Carthage on Thursday, the 20th instant. While Gen. W. H. Harrison was addressing said meeting, among other things, we heard him distinctly say, that he was in the battle of the Thames. He was in front of the battle. The front was not his place; but fool-like, and contrary to the rules of discipline, he was with Col. Johnson in the front columns when the charge was made, and charged with him. He furthermore stated that there was no man on the ground but himself, who was capable of drawing up the men in the order of battle, in which they were drawn up, except one or two to whom he had imparted the plan.

BOYD DILL,
J. COSTNER,
J. M. HARVEY,
J. McMAHON.

Since the above "forlorn hope" was delivered at Carthage, Gen. Harrison has repeated it several times, to the astonishment of friend and foe, and we verily believe that a large portion of the Whig party would now be glad to get rid of him, if they could. After his speech at Hillsborough, on Tuesday of last week, so ridiculous had he presented himself before the people, that only

about twenty persons accompanied him from town to the moon skin show at Chillicothe, through "five thousand" had been promised him as an escort by the News. In Hillsborough, as we learn from the Gazette, he tried to convey the idea that he was not fifty feet from the front rank of the battle!

At Chillicothe, says the Advertiser, "he stated that Col. Johnson was no better qualified to take the command of the army, than any individual would be, (casting his eyes over the audience,) amongst those who were assembled to hear him!!! That the proposition of Col. Johnson to charge the enemy, who were drawn up in line, would have been as preposterous as to have charged yonder brick houses in the city. This evidently much surprised his hearers, and a marked dissatisfaction appeared on their countenances."

After this, it is not any wonder that a prominent Whig remarked a day or so since that the General's friends had better take him home. After this no one will be surprised that the Cleveland Herald said in 1838, that the Whigs lost ground in every county visited by General Harrison in that campaign.

Now for the truth, and surely truth has something to do with this matter. General McAfee is the able historian of the late war, so often quoted, and so universally admired and esteemed by all good men. He was in Col. R. M. Johnson's regiment, and fought under Col. James Johnson in taking the British regulars at the Thames. Here is his testimony, which no one dare contradict:

"Understanding that variant statements have been made in relation to the battle of the Thames, on the 5th of Oct., 1813, and having in the history of the late war, given a condensed statement of the events of that day, without entering into the detail of the same, I deem it due to justice to say, that so far as Col. R. M. Johnson's regiment was concerned I was an eye-witness to nearly all its movements. After we crossed the Thames on that day to the north side, this regiment was placed in the front and pursued the enemy with great rapidity. I was the eldest captain in the first battalion, and of course marched in the centre of the different heads of the lines; when we overtook the British, and when Colonel Johnson had reconnoitered their position, he sent a messenger back to General Harrison, who was with the infantry, with the information, when the General came up and sent Colonel Wood to examine the position; he ordered Colonel Johnson's regiment to take ground to the left, and form on the left flank, intending to bring up the infantry. An attempt was made to cross the swamp to the left, but the difficulty attending the move soon interrupted the execution of this order, and Colonel Johnson was recalled, and some conversation took place between the General and Colonel as to the disposition of the regiment, when Colonel Johnson observed, "General Harrison, if you will permit my regiment to charge the enemy, as I have trained them, we can whip them." After a moment's hesitation, the General replied, "Colonel Johnson, you can do so." We were then almost three hundred yards from the British. I was present when the General and one or two of his aids, (I believe Cols. Todd and Smith) gave the order to charge, which was immediately done. Col. Richard M. Johnson went to take charge of the 2d battalion on the left, against the Indians, and Col. James Johnson the 1st battalion against the British. As soon as the order to charge was given, the General and his aids turned off, as I supposed to bring up the infantry, and I saw no more of them, as in a short time after receiving some scattering and two heavy fires from the British, we broke through their lines and captured the whole, except a portion of the dragoons who fled with Proctor. The British threw down their arms and surrendered to Col. James Johnson, who marched them back until they met the infantry. On this part of the line no other troops were engaged but the mounted men under Col. James Johnson; on the left, where Col. Richard M. Johnson and his battalion fought, the battle lasted for more than half an hour, and was severely contested. As I was not with that battalion I cannot speak personally, but it was generally conceded that the mounted men fought the battle, with the aid only of a small portion of the infantry who got up a short time before the contest was over on the extreme left, where Maj. Thompson fought. This statement is not made to derogate from the fame of any officer, but to do justice to the mounted regiment, who certainly, on the right against the British, did all the fighting on that day; and on the left, against the Indians equally so with the exception above stated. I have no doubt that the infantry would have behaved equally as brave if their position justified it.

ROBT. B. McAFEE.

August 31st, 1840."

The next is the testimony of Maj. Kirtley, who was also in Col. James Johnson's battalion, in taking the British. There is no braver or more honorable man than Maj. Kirtley:

"I was adjutant to the mounted regiment commanded by Col. R. M. Johnson in the late war, and on the day of the battle of the Thames I had an opportunity of seeing the movements of the troops.—Gen. Harri-

son had ordered Col. R. M. Johnson to take possession on the left across the swamp, and prepare to fight the Indians, while he would bring up the infantry to fight the British. This conversation was some three or four hundred yards from the British troops. They separated. Col. Johnson being informed that he could not cross the swamp, sent me with this message to Gen. Harrison. I found him with the infantry nearly one mile in the rear of the mounted regiment. Gen. Harrison upon this information went with me to Colonel Johnson, who was at the head of the columns of the regiment. I was present when Col. Johnson, and Gen. Harrison met and had a conversation on the difficulty of crossing the swamp; I heard Col. Johnson request General Harrison to permit him to bring on the battle by charging the enemy. Gen. Harrison gave the leave and then returned to the infantry—in the mean time Colonel Richard M. Johnson ascertained that he could cross the swamp, and did so with his 2nd battalion, leaving Colonel James Johnson to charge the British with the first battalion. I was present and made the charge with Colonel James Johnson, at the head of the first battalion, and we took the whole British force in very short order, except General Proctor and a few dragoons who ran away. The British enemy surrendered to Colonel James Johnson, who marched them back to General Harrison who was with the infantry. Colonel Richard M. Johnson at the head of the 2nd battalion fought and defeated Tecumseh and his warriors after a severe and bloody conflict. I went in person to the ground where Col. R. M. Johnson in person had fought the Indians with part of his regiment; I know he defeated the Indians at that point without any aid but his own men. I met with a portion of the infantry on the extreme left, not far from where Major Thompson commanded, but the Indians were defeated before the aid joined them. The mounted regiment fought the battle of the Thames. During the whole of our service, Col. R. M. Johnson trained his men to charge on the enemy in columns, and we expected it; none of us were taken by surprise, when we were ordered to charge the enemy; Col. Johnson had prepared his regiment for this desperate mode of fighting.

JEREMIAH KIRTLEY.

Lexington, Sept. 1, 1840."

The above have been published in the Kentucky Yeoman and Globe, and in addition, we give the following, sent to us as confirmation of the above. Here is the testimony of two gentlemen in the infantry under command of Gov. Shelby. They certainly know whether they were in battle or not. Their statement will not be doubted or contradicted. It is signed by Thomas P. Moore, who served as a private soldier at the battle of Missesawawa, and was complimented in general orders by Gen. Harrison—was at the battle of the Thames, and after Gen. Harrison resigned, Major Moore accompanied Gen. McArthur in his perilous expedition into Upper Canada, in the fall of 1814, and had his horse killed under him at the crossing of Grand River and subsequently led the van at the battle of Malcolm's Mills, and was again complimented, by General McArthur. Silas Harlan is the son of a distinguished patriot, and brother to the Hon. Jas. Harlan, late Secretary of State, of Kentucky.

"HARRISBURGH, Mercer Co., Ky., Sept. 14, 1840.

"Dear Sir:

"At your request we make the following statement of facts: In the fall of 1813, in consequence of a call from Gov. Shelby, we marched from Danville, Mercer county, Ky., as subalterns in a mounted company commanded by the late Col. Davenport. Upon reaching head quarters, Col. D. was promoted to the command of a regiment. We were under an impression that we were to serve as mounted infantry; but upon reaching Portage, we were dismounted, and crossed the lake in boats. On our arrival at Sandwich the infantry were joined by Col. R. M. Johnson's regiment of mounted infantry. After some delay, it was announced that we were to pursue Proctor's army. Johnson's regiment marched in front, rendering the roads almost impassable for infantry. After a painful and fatiguing march, in which many of the stoutest were left by the way, Johnson's regiment overhauled the enemy; and that fact was communicated to Gen. Harrison, and by his orders to the infantry we were commanded to advance, and did so, occasionally halting. The delay seemed to us at the time unaccountable; until the discharge of the muskets of the British, and the yell of Col. James Johnson's Battalion, in charging them, announced that the action had commenced, when we advanced at a rapid pace. The firing of the British soon ceased, and we could occasionally hear the discharge of fire arms and the yell of Indians. At this time, Gov. Shelby rode along our lines encouraging us to advance, and we did so to the close of the action. We aver that we saw Gov. Shelby, Gen. Desha, Gen. Allen, Gen. Adair, and Col. J. McDowell during the action, but at no time did we see Gen. Harrison; and that then, and ever since, we considered the mounted regiment as having fought the battle and won the victory. The infantry ardently desired to have participated in it, and complained much of having been compelled to

march so far, and suffer so much, to be made the mere spectators of the fight. We of course know nothing of who originated this novel and dangerous mode of assailing the British regulars and Indians; and only mean to say, that while we know that we suffered on the line of march much more than the mounted regiment, and were as eager to engage the enemy as they could have been, yet we (the infantry) were virtually denied all participation in the glorious achievement. There was one very large company from this county attached to Johnson's regiment, commanded by Capt. (now Gen.) McAfee, and also one company of infantry nearly as large, to which the undersigned belonged; and we do not believe that this statement will be controverted by a single man of either of these two companies.

"In what we have reluctantly said we do not design to insinuate that Gen. Harrison displayed any want of personal courage.

THOS. P. MOORE, of Harrodsburgh, Ky.

SILAS HARLAN, of Mercer Co., Ky."

The position this overwhelming testimony leaves Gen. Harrison before the world, is of his own seeking. It corroborates history, and will not even be contradicted by the General's aids, who seem already driven to the wall with astonishment at their General's audacity and weakness. No wonder that the hard cider enthusiasm is beginning to die away, and the hurrah of glory turning to shame and disgust.

The reception of Mr. Tyler—Old Tip sent off—a splendid jailure—Ohio safe—Federal humbuggery over.

To-day, [Friday,] was to be the great assemblage of original "Jackson men" in this goodly city. But alas! slack-away!! The thing is all over with humbuggery. Harrison was to be here—Tyler was to be here, and all the world was to be here to see the show.

On Tuesday Harrison arrived here from Circleville—on Wednesday he was sent off, for reasons which are whispered here to be that his appearance and conduct required that he should be sent home!—he left. On Thursday evening, [yesterday,] Tyler arrived. He was received out of the city by about 150 "original Jackson men," headed by that old grey-headed man, Alfred Kelly, assisted by Mr. Neil! After the address by Kelly, and reply by Mr. Tyler, a Tip SONG was sung! The procession then came into town, and was landed at the national hotel—247 in procession—another address and reply made, and the affair stopped for Thursday.

To-day, Friday, the procession again formed and about 7 or 800, all told, marched to the ground out of town. The idea of "original Jackson men," after this, will be a song sure enough. The procession was made up of old blue-bellied Federalists, little boys and women! Our paper goes to press—and we close. It is all over with Whiggery in Ohio! Democrats, there is no mistake.—Ohio Statesman, Sept. 25th.

Most triumphant and enthusiastic reception of Colonel Johnson at Wooster.—Hurra for the noble Democracy of old Wayne!

We stated in our last that Col. Johnson, the old Tecumseh killer, passed through this place on Monday morning, to meet his engagements in the North. We never saw the old war-worn veteran look better, or in more animated spirits. The fire of the warrior was in his eye, and his soul swelled within him as he alluded to the base attempts lately made by certificate heroes to rob him of the honors and bravery his country had so long awarded and unsolicited.

He arrived at Wooster, the county seat of Wayne county, in the stage, on Tuesday morning, about sunrise, on his way to Canton. It was soon rumored about that the Hero of the Thames was there. He was prevailed on to remain—runners were sent out, and such was the enthusiasm, that by 2 o'clock in the day, he commenced addressing about THREE THOUSAND PEOPLE. But we cannot do better justice than by inserting an extract from a letter, giving a hasty outline of the enthusiastic occasion:

"WOOSTER, O., Sept. 22, 1840.

"Sir: Col. R. M. Johnson arrived in the stage this morning at sunrise. His friends immediately took charge of him, and paid him every honor—sent out runners, and at 2 o'clock he addressed about 3000 people upwards of three hours and a half; and a more attentive and interesting audience I have not witnessed—scarcely a man moving from his place till the close; and during the whole period the most animated cheering and shouting approbation was given by the crowd. A large number of ladies occupied the Baptist church, and the gentlemen the street, and Col. Johnson spoke at the window."

"NOTES FOR MY SPEECH AT RICHMOND."

The manuscript from which we make the following extracts is in our possession. We cannot undertake to designate the owner of it. As it may be of some value to the writer, and as the best mode we can think of for enabling him to reclaim his property, we publish below a sufficient number of extracts to enable him to identify it, which will be delivered to him or his order, on presenting proper proof of ownership.—Globe.

"Notes for my Speech at Richmond."

"Quote Harrington in support of the property basis. *Mem.*—Harrington holds that the two bases of all legitimate governments, are mind and property; and that the former being a divine gift, the latter an acquisition of men, mind ought not to have any thing to do with Government." Say nothing about our friends the Abolitionists making war on the property of the South, and of the effect their doctrine, that slaves are not property, would have on their representation in Congress. Cry up Harrington to the skies—nobody reads folios now, and I can make him say what I please, especially to the "big paws." I quizzed them handsomely at Patchogue, but it won't do to play the same game with the chivalry of Virginia. *Mem.*—Not to forget to tickle them about being the great bulwark of State Rights and Constitutional principles, and say nothing about my own; as they won't do South of Mason and Dixon's line.

"*Mem.*—Play General Mum, about being a Democrat of the Jeffersonian school, it did well enough for the "Big Paws" of Old Suffolk, but won't go at Richmond. But, on reflection, they won't believe me, or I should undergo the martyrdom of St. Stephen. It will be a d—l of a job to reconcile the Whig principles of Old Massachusetts and Old Virginia; but never mind, I must look as serious as a judge, and follow the example of our standard-bearer, by dodging every point-blank shot, and if I am hard run, get into a great passion, and call all the world liars and cowards. *Mem.*—There is no danger in challenging the world, as it never fights duels.

"Eulogize State Rights, and remember that though I am speaking to Consolidationists, my speech is in reality intended for the Loco Focos. My Whig friends will understand it is all humbug, and applaud it to the skies. Compliment Billy Rives, though it goes against my conscience—the Little Expunger; but never mind; when he has done his business, we shall have a reckoning with him. *Mem.* To say nothing about the hand I had in the 'World's Convention' at London—won't do here; it is sufficient my friends the Abolitionists know all about that business.

"*Mem.* On second thought, I had better not call every body that says I am an Aristocrat liars and cowards—some of these bloody long-sided Loco Foco Virginians may take up the gauntlet, and I have conscientious scruples about fighting, either for my principles or my country. *Mem.*—Quote Harrington again—it looks knowing, and nobody can contradict me. Praise General Washington, though he was too Democratic for me, and his opinions about paper money smack of the Loco Focos. *Mem.*—To keep constantly in mind that I am not speaking to the Boston Whigs, and say nothing about being hand and glove with the Abolitionists. Remember I am south of Mason and Dixon's line, and point my compass accordingly. I am a State Rights man, and whoever says the contrary, is a liar and a coward, damme.

"*Mem.* "To be or not to be," as HAMLET says. Quere: shall I touch them up with a little Patchogue simplicity, or soar into the regions of the sublime? Shall I play the farmer or the godlike man? The solemn Aristocrat or the slipshod buffoon? I should like to give them a rip or two about their niggers; to please my friends the Abolitionists, but it won't do—they are *noli me tangere*. I must leave it to the Standard-Bearer to settle these points, though between I and myself, he is such a bungler at playing JANUS, that I am ashamed of him. Hum—yes it shall be so. We must have him shut up in his log cabin again, for the old fellow can't even fix with any decent consistency. But to the point.—What character shall I play? Never mind, trust to Providence and inspiration. Keep as sober as a deacon, and take care not to apout after dinner.

"We were so struck with this monstrous absurdity, that we consulted an old folio copy of Harrington, and found that this is in substance the basis of his Ideal Commonwealth of Oceana.

[Editor Globe.

(From the Albany Argus of September 29.)

MR. WEBSTER'S VERACITY.—The Massachusetts Senator in his speech at Patchogue, alluding to the expenses of the Florida war, made this statement among others of a similarly extravagant character. We quote from a report of his speech in a New York Whig paper:

"Then there are two or three prices paid for corn, \$7 a day for a horse and cart, twenty dollars a cord paid for wood brought from New Orleans to one of the forts; and when it reached the landing in Florida, the oak trees were so thick that they couldn't get it to the fort. (Roars of laughter and cheering.)"

We will not say of Mr. Webster as he says of those who call him an Aristocrat, that he is "a liar," but we have the documents to show that his own choice epithet is applicable at least in this instance to himself. As long ago as April last, the Secretary of War addressed a letter to Gen. Jesup, Quartermaster-General in Florida, inquiring into the truth of the specific charge now repeated by Mr. Webster to the farmers of Old Suffolk, and received an answer of which the following is an extract:

"QUARTERMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,

"Washington, August 11, 1840.

"Sir: In reply to your inquiry, whether, under your

administration of the War Department, or during the Presidency of Mr. Van Buren, wood for steamboats has been transported from New Orleans to Florida at twenty dollars a cord, I have the honor to report that, during the period referred to, NO FUEL HAS BEEN TRANSPORTED FROM NEW ORLEANS TO FLORIDA AT THAT OR ANY OTHER RATE.

TH. S. JESUP.

Maj. General and Quartermaster General."

Mr. Webster and his Federal friends may put that in their pipes and smoke it. Meanwhile, what will an honest and intelligent community think of this attempt of the great champion of modern Whiggery and Black Cockade Federalism, to deceive the people, by a gross, shall we not say a wilful, falsification of facts—proved to be such by the public documents?

TENNESSEE.—We have seen a letter from a distinguished citizen of Tennessee, just received, which states confidently that the state will go for Van Buren, by a decided majority.—Balt. Republican.

Democratic Association of the City of Richmond.

The following Report was presented to the Association by a Committee on Wednesday night, adopted and ordered to be published:

Your Committee, appointed under a Resolution of this Association, beg leave to Report:

That the Capital of Virginia, in these "extraordinary" times, has indeed become the scene of the most novel and "extraordinary" exhibitions that have ever been enacted in this old Commonwealth. It is the first time in our history, that such a scene has been presented in Virginia. Heretofore, her sons have been appealed to in the voice of reason and the language of patriotism, unaccompanied by devices to please the eye, or captivate the passions.—Now, in the estimation of our opponents, the time for reasoning seems to have gone by, and it has been deemed necessary to resort to other means as a substitute for argument. This, your Committee regard as one of the most fearful signs of the times.—Ours is emphatically a Government based on the virtue, intelligence and capacity of man for self-government. In European Governments, where this doctrine is repudiated and laughed to scorn, the most debasing means are resorted to by the rich and well-born, to secure the object of their ambition—office. All such means have heretofore in Virginia received neither countenance nor favor; or, if resorted to at all, by only a few, as a mere pastime or sport; but ambition, the desire of office, or the violence of party excitement, has so maddened the leaders of the Whig party, that not only a few, and those the idle and vicious, have been incited to use such means, but a regular system has been introduced to humbug and delude the people, from their great captain, down to the corporal in their ranks.

Your Committee would not presume the object of the resolution under which they are acting was, to enjoin upon them the labor of entering into a minute detail of the undignified exhibition they have witnessed, and the insulting language which has been heard within the last three days, during which the Whig Convention has been sitting here. Such a construction would subject them to much labor without profit, and exhaust the patience of those who might otherwise be disposed to give an ear, if their inquiries were more restricted. In this view of their duty then they have confined themselves to but few topics of a striking character—apologizing to the Association for the desultory and uninteresting manner in which they are thrown together and treated.

Then, what have we seen exhibited in the Metropolis of Virginia? On Monday last, according to previous notice given and extensive arrangements made, the Whigs assembled in this City, at the invitation and fiat of a party Junto, from about half the counties in this State and from various other portions of the Union, bringing with them all manner of devices, banners and flags. They do not appear to have come to reason and deliberate on the affairs of the country, or to promulgate the great principles of their party, but to make a show and a pageant. They accordingly with music and drum; with flags and banners; with a log cabin and its usual ridiculous paraphernalia—drawn by six mules—formed a procession consisting of between three and four thousand persons (including many citizens, boys and delegates from beyond the borders of the State.) This number fell far short of the previous extravagant expectations of their own party, and has had a corresponding effect on their aspirations and hopes of success. In spite of this disappointment they mustered their forces and performed a feat similar to that wherein

"The King of France with 20,000 men,
Marched up the hill, and then marched down again."

They occupied the Capitol of the State, and its grounds, which they had decorated and arranged for the occasion, where their orators have been three days lavishing the most unjustifiable imputations upon the President and Democratic party—Yes, a minority party in the State of Virginia have appropriated the public grounds; and there under the flag of the State, which they have misused for party purposes and raised on the top of the Capitol, have they been deluging this whole community with the most extraordinary misre-

presentations. Your committee have not been inattentive observers of the objectionable transactions, which have marked this meeting of the Federal Whigs of Virginia. They have seen enough to satisfy them that in word and action, they and their labors are scarcely entitled to the countenance and support of reasonable men of all parties. Ought a party which resorts to such expedients to be trusted? Will the people of this Commonwealth trust them? Your committee confidently believe not. They have a few specifications only to offer, which they commend to the serious attention of this Association, and all who feel an interest in the concerns of their country.

We have said, that they appropriated the public grounds and part of the Capitol of Virginia. This is true, and will not be denied. They posted their sentinels at each of the three gates of the enclosure—attempted to exclude all, except ladies, until those who wore the badge of their party and joined in their procession had first been admitted. What right had they to lay an embargo on the whole Capitol Square, and prevent any freeman from visiting the Capitol of his State? A number of persons were refused admittance under this high handed and arbitrary assumption. One gentleman, with his wife, made application for admission, who had determined to vote against Mr. Van Buren, but said, since the Whigs have usurped the Capitol Square, and assumed to deny him entrance, he would, if he lived till November, change his determination, and vote for Martin Van Buren. Another, after admission, was rudely thrust down from the stand whereon the Speakers stood—he instantly tore the badge from his coat, and exclaimed, "If this is Whig friendship for the poor, I renounce all connection with them, and swear to vote for Martin Van Buren." We have heard of a variety of changes in consequence of this effort of the Whigs to gull and deceive the people.

In reference to the speakers, some of your committee have to say, that never in the whole course of their life, have they listened to such vehement and undignified assertions. We do not understand, that one single word was said by any of them in relation to the Bank, a Tariff, or Internal Improvements. They made no exposition of the principles their candidate would pursue, if elected. They defended him against none of the numerous charges brought against him by the Democratic party. It was enough for them to distort the measures of the Administration, and to ascribe motives and objects to Mr. Van Buren, which he has repudiated, and of which they ought to have known he was not guilty. This was the very charitable office of those speakers to whom it was the lot of some of your committee to listen.

They would be recreant to their first duty, as citizens, if they did not take this occasion to express their strong sense of the indignation they feel, in common with every member of the Democratic party with whom they have conversed on the subject, and not a few of the Whigs themselves, at the insult which has been offered to the principles of their State by those who had brought amongst them the Hon. Daniel Webster of Massachusetts to teach them patriotism and political wisdom! They entertain no hostility to Mr. Webster as a man and a gentleman—and had he come among them as such, and not as a political missionary, none would have thrown open to him more readily the rites of hospitality and friendship; but he comes in the latter character—a man, 'tis true, but a politician also, who has more uniformly opposed the doctrines of Virginia and the men of Virginia, than any other man in the U. S. Could it be expected that under these circumstances, the Democrats of Virginia would extend to Mr. Webster the right hand of fellowship? No—they would deem themselves guilty of treason to the land of Jefferson and Madison, were they to have done so. Mr. Webster is a Federalist of the olden school. Yet we could have respected him, had he come under his true colors and maintained the principles of his whole life; but he has come in an entirely new character as a politician. He has told this community that he is a Democrat—a Jeffersonian Democrat. For this we cannot respect him, because we are compelled to suspect the sincerity of his declarations, being so inconsistent with his ultra Federalism. Can he be a friend to Madison's Resolutions, who advocated the Proclamation unexplained; who is in favor of a Bank, a Tariff and Internal Improvements, to say nothing of the assumption of the State Debts and other Federal measures? Is he the man to teach us Virginia Jeffersonian doctrine and love for Madison, whom he opposed, as well as for Thomas Jefferson, whose professions he pronounced to be false? Can he teach us patriotism, who opposed the war and refused to vote a dollar to feed a hungry and starving soldiery? Can he teach us patriotism, who co-operated with a party that proclaimed it was immoral and irreligious to rejoice at the victories obtained over a foe that was ravaging our coast and violating our women. We need no such teacher, *We know him not.* Well may Mr. Webster say, words are not things, professions are not principles, and, to use the classic language of his own Suffolk speech, "fair words,

butler no parsnips." In the language of the Scriptures, "we judge the tree by its fruit." We judge Mr. Webster, not by his empty, well-concocted words on the Portico of our Capitol; but by his overt acts; by his votes in the Senate Chamber. This gentleman, after a degree of unsatisfactory opposition to the South on Abolition, in the Senate of the U. States, and through his friends in the legislature of Massachusetts, proclaimed in his speech on Monday last, not that he was the friend of the South, but that Congress had no power either direct or indirect to interfere with the institution of slavery, and referred to his speech in 1830, as containing the opinions he then entertained. Your committee have examined that speech, and do not hesitate to say that after all of Mr. Webster's parade on this subject he is no nearer the point now than before. In that speech he says not a word about the Territories or the District, leaving the reader to infer that Congress has power over both—the District of Columbia, being that point of the Southern entrenchments against which the artillery of the Abolitionists has hitherto been principally directed and will continue to be pointed. Nor amid all his professions does Mr. Webster disclaim the right of Petition, as to the District, along with its inevitable consequences of debate, agitation, the excitement of sectional feeling, by which the bonds of the Union are gradually weakened, and may be ultimately torn asunder.

These professions of Mr. Webster are made too in the face of the most notorious facts—In 1836, he voted against the resolution of Mr. Buchanan, in a minority of six, to reject the prayer of a petition from Lancaster for the emancipation of slaves in the District of Columbia. In the same session, he voted against a bill to arrest the circulation of incendiary publications in the South, when Mr. Van Buren gave his casting vote in favor of it—And as late as 1838, he voted in small minorities against Mr. Calhoun's celebrated resolutions, denying the right of Abolitionists to petition, or of Congress to interfere with the subject of slavery in the States, in the Territories, and in the District of Columbia. Although his Monday's speech was delivered under duress, in the presence of a Virginia audience, it is still very unsatisfactory to us; for, even some of the anti-slavery associations have taken similar ground in their constitutions in relation to the States. Mr. Webster's new character may be considered one of the greatest humbugs of the age, since with all his Federal heresies he can humbug an audience of Virginia Whigs.

Your committee come now to speak of a gentleman who has once been Governor of this State, and was the President of the Convention—they deeply regret the necessity which compels them to allude in any other terms than of respect for a gentleman who has filled so distinguished an office, and whose years under ordinary circumstances would entitle him to marked courtesy and forbearance—but your committee feel constrained to throw off all reserve, and speak of him as freemen should speak, when he dare insult them. The remarks made by this gentleman were harsh and coarse beyond a parallel—he did not scruple to indulge in the coarsest language towards the President and his friends. If some of the committee remember him correctly, he applied language to the following effect to the Democratic party—your committee will endeavor not to add to or subtract one word from what he did say—Thank God, said he, that no bobtail politicians belong to the Whigs—all such are comprised in the Administration party—Whenever he heard such defending the Administration, he felt conscious that they had some compensation from the Government in the shape of a contract in their pockets, or expected it—Whenever they were zealous, he knew they had access in some way or other to the public treasure, like the Priests of Bel, through a private trapdoor where they entered "to feed upon the flour, the sheep, and the wine"—Though he did not expressly say, that every one in the Democratic party were bobtails; yet his expressions were so broad that the inference of his extending it to the whole party, it appeared to some of his Democratic hearers, was almost irresistible. In another part of his speech he said, they were so corrupt that they actually looked back upon Judas Iscariot with jealousy—envying him the good bargain he had made in the sale of his Lord and Master. He used many expressions of the most offensive kind, charging the "bobtails" with being the basest and most corrupt of mankind, and of being traitors to their country, or ready to sell her for their 30 pieces of silver. This is the language, as well as your committee can now recollect or ascertain, which was used by the President of the great Whig Convention on Tuesday last, towards those who dared to entertain and express different opinions from his own. What will be thought of such language coming from one who had been elected for his wisdom and moderation to preside over a meeting, at which the great Daniel Webster was a guest?

Some of your committee will furnish another instance of the disregard of the rights and feelings of others in these extraordinary times. A member of Congress was expatiating on the Hooe case, and in order to make the subject as objectionable and offensive

as possible to Christian and Southern prejudices, said that Lieut. Hooe was condemned on the accusation of a Jew and the testimony of a free negro, as though a Jew were not as competent to make an accusation as any other free white citizen, and as if Mr. Hooe was condemned on the testimony of a free negro. Your committee will not add a word to show the kind of spirit which pervades the Opposition party towards all those who dare maintain an independent opinion—Another member of Congress was very violent. He stated, that he had understood, that the death of Gen. Harrison was going to be circulated just before the election, and that the Whig party had only one thing to fear, and that was, that the Loco Focos were none too good to poison him.

Another speaker in the glow of his feelings, though Mr. Webster had declared himself a Democrat, exclaimed in the voice of Stentor, that he hoped that there never would be another Democratic President: a voice from the crowd was heard "of the present stamp." He repeated the declaration and said, never! never! another Democratic President. Your committee cannot understand this violence and inconsistency—what does it mean? Mr. Webster comes from Massachusetts to tell us he is a Democrat, and his friend declares on the same spot he hopes there never will be another Democratic President. Does not this furnish proof of gross inconsistency? We leave others to judge.

Nothing is more "extraordinary," in all these scenes, than the profound silence which this Convention have observed in relation to their own principles or those of their Party. Coming together in a form so striking, it might have been expected, that a body claimed to be so numerous, would have been proud of an opportunity of proclaiming their principles to the world. Our own Convention at Charlottesville, left nothing to ask in this respect. They avowed, in the frankest manner, the opinions of Martin Van Buren. But not so, this Whig Convention. They have not drawn the veil aside, which covered their own candidate. Their Address, which was prepared and even printed before the Convention assembled, is profoundly silent about the principles of their candidate—So was Mr. Webster—so was Mr. Rives, who addressed the Convention at great length on Tuesday morning—and yet carefully avoided the Bank, the Tariff, the system of Internal Improvements, and the other great questions which have so much engaged the attention of Southern Politicians. Is such a Party, and such a Candidate, entitled to the confidence of the free and proud People of this "unterrified Commonwealth"?

In conclusion, your committee would most earnestly call the attention of this Association to the state of things as manifested at the late Whig Convention in this City; and most respectfully urge upon them and their fellow-citizens throughout all Virginia, the adoption of all honorable means to defeat a party so intolerant, reckless and proscriptive.

[From the New York Evening Post, October 6.]

When Watkins Leigh of Virginia attended the Harrisburg Convention, at which Harrison was nominated, he advised the Whig party to make no declarations of opinion, to beware of putting themselves on the defensive, but on the contrary to act only the part of assailants, and "to carry the war into Africa." What Mr. Leigh meant by carrying the war into Africa he has since illustrated. He is laboring to convince the Virginians, as a reason for not supporting the present administration, that the Democrats of the North are in grain Abolitionists. He made a speech at Southampton, in Virginia, on Monday the 21st, in which to excite the prejudices of his hearers against the Administration, he read two letters from a man in Connecticut, named Noyes Barber, sometimes styled the Honorable Noyes Barber, on account of having been some years a member of Congress. The purport of these letters was that the Democratic celebration of the 5th of September, on Groton Heights, was a mixed affair of whites and negroes. We give the letters as they were read by the political gladiator who is so zealous for carrying the war into Africa, and as they were published in the Petersburg Intelligencer, a Virginia print of the Whig party:

"GROTON, CONNECTICUT, Sept. 14, 1840.

"Dear Sir: I gave facts without comment, on Saturday, the 5th of September, 1840. The National Administration party celebrated the passage of the Sub-Treasury bill at old Fort Griswold, on Groton Heights. The procession formed in this village. The Grand Marshal of the day, on horseback was Gen. Geo. C. Wilson, of New London, one of the most active and distinguished Abolitionists in Connecticut. They marched from this place to the sacred spot named, with negroes in their ranks, and were there addressed, under the walls of Groton monument by Hugh A. Garland, of Virginia, and others.

I am, &c.

NOYES BARBER."

The above letter was enclosed in another of the same date, in the following words:

"GROTON, Conn., Sept. 14, 1840.

"Dear Sir: Permit me to renew our former acquaintance, and at the same time say I have received a letter

from the Hon. W. W. Boardman of New Haven, Conn., requesting me to forward you a statement of facts respecting the celebration on the 5th inst., by the Loco Focos on Groton Heights, which I have done, and here enclose the same to you without comment. As there were so many witnesses, the fact being public, I did not esteem it necessary to procure witnesses. Negroes were never before permitted in the ranks of white citizens in Connecticut; and what could have induced the party at this time to permit such an act but to obtain Abolition votes, I cannot imagine.

I am, &c.

NOYES BARBER.

"P. S. You will find in all the Whig papers in Connecticut, the facts I have stated respecting the negroes in the ranks of the Locos in the celebration on Groton Heights. All the statements are true so far. Why it was permitted, I must leave all to determine for themselves—and why did they permit an Abolitionist to lead them on this occasion? N. B."

This story of Noyes Barber is utterly untrue, and is known to be so by every person who was on the ground. We have been assured of its falsehood by persons of credibility who were present at the celebration, and we find it denied in the strongest terms, in the New London Gazette.

Probably Mr. Barber did not expect, when he wrote the letter, that it would be published, and that he would be confronted with his own falsehood.

This comes of carrying the war into Africa. A party which has no avowed principles of its own to support and defend, and which is reduced to acting merely on the offensive against a party professing reasonable principles and proposing salutary measures, will naturally run into slander and misrepresentation. If it will attack, it can scarcely find any other weapons. A lie is always at hand; a good cause of objection may be difficult to find. Hence it is that Mr. Leigh, who ought to be in better business, is content to exhibit himself as a retailer of gossiping fictions, and labors to work upon the prejudices of Virginians, by reading to them letters which he ought instantly to have put into the fire.

A letter has been received at Washington, from General Jackson. "He is sanguine of Tennessee, and of the general result. He speaks boldly of the great calamity to the country, that the election of Gen. Harrison would produce."

Prenez garde!—Look out for Whappers!

A Correspondent from Washington informs us, that "The Whigs have some startling scheme on hand. They have prepared thousands of Documents here as the instruments to carry it out. They are carefully locked up for the present."

A WHIG SONG—FOR THE LOCO FOCO PRES.

VOTING DAY.

TUNE—WASHINGTON.

Our cause with clouds was overcast,
Our hopes began to fail,
When we devised a plan at last,
To raise a heavy squall.
We told old Hal and Winfield Scott
To get out of the way;
For, triumph with them we could not,
Upon a voting day.
So 'tis march, march, drum, drum,
Shout, shout away,
With Harrison we'll go a-head
UNTIL the voting day.
Our cause, it is a glorious one,
There's none so free from evil:
Van Buren is a sorcerer,
And Benton is the devil.
One fact the lokys can't mistake;
One truth they won't gainsay,
That Whigs prodigious efforts make
Before the voting day.
For, 'tis march, march, drum, drum,
Shout, shout away,
And so we always go a-head
UNTIL the voting day.

A fellow once inquired of me
If our old Hal was dead;
"I understand he is," said he,
"And also buried."
"Oh no," said I, "it is not true,
The Whigs were all for Clay,
Until they found he wouldn't do
Upon a voting day."
So 'tis march, march, drum, drum,
Shout, shout away,
With Harrison we'll go ahead,
UNTIL the voting day.

A lanky foky passing by
Our cabin made of logs,
At me one day cocked up his eye,
Exclaiming "jolly dogs!"
Says he, "you like the laboring class,
You go for bone and gristle—
I'm half inclined before I pass,
To stop and wet my whistle."
For 'tis tap, tap, swig, swig,
Tap, tap away,
And let us all be merry boys,
UNTIL the voting day.

When to the table we went up,
He lifted high in air,
A big old fashioned powder cup,
With lots of cider there—
And ere he swallowed its contents,
With three capacious swigs,
Says he, "I'll bet you fifty cents
The Lokys whip the Whigs."
For 'tis tap, tap, swig, swig,
Tap, tap away,
I guess you'll find your cider sour,
Upon the voting day.

RICHMOND, Va., WEDNESDAY, OCT. 14.

"A wise and frugal Government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement; and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."—MR. JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Democratic Central Committee.

The Committee are informed of the lamented death of the worthy and respected Hierome L. Opie, Esq., of the county of Jefferson, whose name was placed on the Van Buren Electoral Ticket by the Republican Convention of February last. To supply this vacancy, they have determined to recommend to the People of Virginia, Major Henry Bedinger, of Berkeley, a Veteran of the Revolution—who commenced his career under Washington at the beginning of the war, and served his country to its close. He is now in the 78th year of his age—and still true to those great Whig principles which he vindicated with his sword—not the pseudo-Whiggery of modern times. It gives the Committee great pleasure to offer this tribute of gratitude and respect to his services and his principles.

THOMAS RITCHIE,

Sec'y to the Cen. Com.

The County Corresponding Committees are requested to see, that all the Electoral Tickets, which have already been issued, should be corrected accordingly.

In the introductory remarks to his speech before the late Whig Convention of this City, Mr. Webster virtually admits that there were some questions of National policy and Constitutional power on which he differed with the Whigs of Virginia. This virtual admission was unnecessary, for every body knew that.—But why did not Mr. Webster say what those questions were, and whether Gen. Harrison, if elected, would act on them or not? We know Mr. Webster to be a Federalist—we know he is in favor of a Bank of the U. S.—of a Tariff to protect his constituents at the expense of the South—of a splendid scheme for Internal Improvements to spend the money, &c. Then, since Mr. Webster had been sent for five hundred miles to come from Massachusetts to enlighten Virginians, why did he not discuss the great constitutional questions which have so deeply concerned the country for the last ten years, and say whether General Harrison would carry out this or that system of policy? No; this was not the game Mr. Webster was sent for to play. His was to act another part. The discussion of questions like these would have been susceptible of definition by the intelligent Democracy of Virginia.—Hence it was determined to enter upon the boundless field of Executive denunciation, and seem to prove by the vaguest generalities in the world, that the power of the President was too great for a Republic. This has been the incessant and unmeaning cry of the Whig slangwaggers in this State for years back, and well did Mr. Webster say, "I know something of the community amidst which I stand and its disposition for political disquisition;" and here Mr. W. commences to prove that the Executive is too strong and wields a power dangerous to liberty. To do so, he has first to assume what is false, that for several years a decisive majority of the whole people of the United States have been opposed to the administration, and that they have not been able to effect a removal from office of the President—this sounds very much like foolishness to our mind. If there be any truth in such a statement as this, why could not J. Q. Adams retain his seat in spite of the public will, and sustained as he was by Mr. Webster—since then the people have voted three times for President, and one has retired from office if not removed, yet they have not been able to effect a removal of their President? Does Mr. Webster wish Mr. Van Buren to retire from office at his and the bidding of the Whigs, because he and they may assume that a majority of the people are opposed to him? Cannot Mr. Webster prove his accusations against the President without assuming what is false? It seems not—then the premises being wrong, the superstructure cannot stand. But he proceeds to argue from the growth of the country, involving a multiplication of officers and an increase of expenditures, that the power of the President is too large, but fails to point out a remedy; forgetting that if General Harrison is elected, the same patronage will be wielded by him, and a part of it, no doubt, for the benefit of Webster himself. But Mr. Webster ought to know that the patronage he speaks of is a disadvantage in a Republic like ours to him who possesses it. Offices under all Governments must be bestowed on some one, let who will be the Executive—there always will be more applicants than offices. He who confers the appointments will always have his partialities and prejudices. These things are unavoidable. They belong to the nature of man, and spring from the nature of Government.—

* "Give us the patronage (said Mr. Clay) and we will retain the power." He had it, and notwithstanding they were turned out by an indignant people. So will it be, if W. H. Harrison should happen to be elected.

When, therefore, the appointing power confers office on one, it gives offence to perhaps ten or more office-seekers. The bestowment of office then, so far from benefiting him who confers it, is a disadvantage. But, supposing it to be otherwise, for argument, can it be expected that danger would accrue to the Republic, when, to say the least, these offices are sought after by an equal number of office-seekers of each political party, and whose motives, if not honest, it may be presumed, are liable, in an equal degree, to the same suspicions?—But again: this patronage is a disadvantage, because the very moment an appointment is made of an individual who has taken part in political questions, he is drawn away from the community in which he resided, and never fails to part with a large share of his moral and political influence. And indeed, it must be conceded to be true, that whenever any such take an active part in political matters in behalf of him who conferred the office, his efforts are always attended with injurious consequences; whilst, on the contrary, if they take part against the power which appoints them, they are invariably listened to with confidence and respect, because it is presumed that they speak knowingly what they say, and their testimony does not lie under the same suspicion, as they generally make the people believe they are testifying against themselves and at the hazard of their office. These positions are incontestably true. Yet this one subject of patronage has been made the burden of Mr. Webster's song in Richmond, and magnified by him into something exceedingly dreadful, in order to alarm the people with the President. To prove that this patronage has been thus disastrous to those who have wielded it, reference might be made to the effort of Messrs. Adams and Clay, to hold on to the Presidency in 1828, and to the late history of N. York, and nearly all the States in New England.

The power of removal from office is also relied on by Mr. Webster to prove that the Executive has too much influence. If the reasoning we have made use of in the bestowment of office be correct, this at once falls to the ground, for no President ever would turn a man out of office for not using exertions to promote his aims, if they were not to avail him any thing. Such a requirement would be the essence of despotism: it would outstrip either Nero or Caligula, in their cold-blooded tyranny. But this power of removal has been conferred on the President by the framers of the Constitution, for wise purposes, and however it may have heretofore been exercised by other Presidents, Mr. Van Buren is altogether blameless for the removals made since his election. There is no evidence that this power has been exercised by him in even a single instance, that it was not demanded by the public interest, and even in many instances the sacrifice of a political friend; yet this mild and salutary exercise of the power of removal, has been tortured into a hobgoblin, for political purposes, and that too by Mr. Webster, who has uniformly been the friend of as much power, as can be conferred on the President, either directly or by construction. Mr. Webster says that in some instances, this "power has been exercised remorselessly." In bringing so grave an accusation against Mr. Van Buren, ought not Mr. Webster to have specified the instances? He ought to have done so. Did he allude to Mr. Van Rensselaer? If so, that removal was justifiable beyond all doubt, because he was old and incompetent to discharge the duties of Post-Master at Albany—but had he been removed solely to make way for Mr. Flagg, it was but an act of retributive justice; for not only he, but a thousand other Democrats had been removed just before from office by the Whig Governor (Seward,) of New York. In all these removals, for opinion's sake notoriously, and we might say avowedly, Mr. Webster could see nothing "remorselessly" done; but because Mr. Van Buren for cause, made a single removal in New York, it was "remorseless." Did he allude to Mr. Campbell? The habits and incompetency of this gentleman are too notorious to require any defence of the President for this removal. In one breath the President is abused for not turning out worthless and incompetent officers, and when he does so, is abused for that in turn. It seems that the abuse in the first instance is poured out upon him, that in the second capital may be made of it. If it is right for the President to discard an incompetent or faithless officer; must it not be wrong for the Whigs to keep him company, and can any thing he would say against the President be worthy of credence?

Another means, in the opinion of Mr. Webster, by which the Executive power has reached its present alarming height, is a patronized press. A patronized press! Wretched expedient, Mr. Webster!—this is a branch of Executive power so easily cut off, that we are surprised Mr. Webster has not made an effort, in his capacity as Senator, to effect its diminution. We are well convinced, had such a step been proposed, no opposition would have been made by the President.—But he says, "Have you not, men of Virginia, been mortified to witness the importance which is attached at Washington to the election of public printers?" We would ask Mr. Webster, if by this inquiry he meant to assert, that the election of a public printer to do the

printing for Congress had any thing to do with the patronage or power of the President? Does he hold the Executive responsible for the patronage also which belongs to the two Houses of Congress? and if so, why has he so often and invariably voted for Gales & Seaton as "public printers?" The practice of Congress always has been to elect their printers—a practice to which Mr. Webster, though many years a member of that body, never has excepted until now, when it suited his convenience to help him along with a speech before an audience of Virginia Whigs. The only patronage which accrues to the Executive from this source, is such printing only as Congress requires him to execute—This is the publication of the Laws, and that required necessarily for all the Executive Departments. Heretofore we have gotten along without much danger to our liberties on this account; indeed, no one has, until late, observed that it was a discretion dangerous to liberty in an Executive officer to make a contract with a printer to do such work as his particular duties might require. But if this discretion is dangerous, and the printers such a purchasable commodity, we say cut the connection, and divorce Press and State as well as Bank and State. But this whole alarm about a Government patronage in a public printer, we believe hypocrisy and nonsense. It is nothing more nor less than to say, that the People are ignorant and incapable of discerning the truth. It is an attack on their intelligence. "I don't want the Government printer," says Mr. Webster, "to preach politics to the People, because I know beforehand what politics he will preach." This then, is an antidote to the evil. If service of this sort justly subjects the printer to suspicion and distrust, why, the people will know it, and no harm is done.—No wonder Mr. Webster does not wait politics "preached to the People"—such preaching is at war with the Aristocratic notion of his, that the Government should take care of the rich and the rich of the poor.

Mr. Webster assigns several other causes that have increased Executive power—these, to be sure, are singular and extraordinary—party is one of these causes. Why, if the People stick to their principles and sustain a man to carry them out, it is confirming, says Mr. Webster, Executive power—but the Whigs manifest more party spirit than the Democrats. Then they are more to blame! Such reasoning as this is absolutely insulting—it certainly ought to be laughed at.

He also says, that the use of particular names is a cause of increase of Executive power. How, we cannot see. His friends have used all manner of names—and now Whig. But more of this at another place.

"Have you for a month past heard any one defend the Sub-Treasury? Have you heard any man during that term burn his fingers by taking hold of Mr. Poinsett's militia bill?"—(quære, heard a man burn his fingers?) Does Mr. Webster expect to render the Sub-Treasury unpopular, and make the people believe the bill of Mr. Poinsett's is a measure of the Democratic party by a taunt or a sneer? If so, he will be mistaken—the people here will have sense enough to understand such arguments—they know the Democratic party have at all times courted and sought a fair discussion of the Sub-Treasury question, and that the Whigs have avoided it—they know the Whigs themselves in 1834, were in favor of it to a man, and would not now oppose so just a measure, but for its having been proposed by the President. As to Mr. Poinsett's bill, it originated with him—has been disapproved by the President—by the Administration party in Congress, and unfavorable reports had upon it in both houses. It is no question for the people, and no more before them now, than if it had never been heard of—but what is most amusing, the Whigs claim credit for abusing a scheme which the Democrats themselves defeated! For Mr. Webster to descend to such pitiful sophistries is truly surprising.

Mr. Webster says, that another contrivance for the increase of Executive power, is to be found in a disregard of the wholesome admonition of the father of his country, in his farewell address, wherein he guards the people against the influence of sectional differences, prejudices, and jealousies. Though we are unable to comprehend this argument, will Mr. Webster be good enough to tell, which party has been at all times to blame for this contrivance to increase Executive power?—Certainly not the Democratic party—there is nothing in their creed, principles, or motives of action, to encourage sectional jealousies—every thing in that of the party to which Mr. Webster belongs—therefore he and his party are to blame on this score—are they not in favor of a Bank, which benefits one section at the expense of another, and one class of individuals at the expense of another class? Are they not in favor of a Tariff, and Internal Improvements, with alike effect? Do not he and his friends in the non-slaveholding States keep up an incessant agitation on the subject of Abolition?—Have not all their Legislatures when they have had a majority, encouraged the Abolitionists to persevere in their designs upon the Institution of Slavery in the South, jeopardizing their peace, quiet, and safety? Mr. Webster and his friends are to blame then for all increase of Executive power on this account, if he can

show how, and that it does in fact, strengthen Executive power.

But these far-fetched conclusions by Mr. Webster fully demonstrate the peculiarity of his position, when he undertakes to prove the Executive too strong, when it is seen from the following extract, from his speech at Worcester, in 1832, that he then took the ground, that the Executive was pursuing a policy that would weaken and render inefficient, that arm of Federal power:

Extract from the Speech of Daniel Webster, at the National Republican Convention, in Worcester, Mass. October 12, 1832.

"In the first place, any Administration is dangerous to the Constitution, and to the Union of the States, which denies the essential powers of the Constitution, and thus strips it of the capacity to do the good intended by it.

"The principles embraced by the Administration, and expressed in the Veto Message, are evidently hostile to the whole system of protection, by duties of impost, on constitutional grounds. Here then, is one great power struck at once out of the Constitution, and one great end of its adoption defeated; and while this power is thus struck out of the Constitution, it is clear that it exists nowhere else, since the Constitution expressly takes it away from the States.

"The Veto Message denies the constitutional power of creating or continuing such an institution, as our whole experience has approved, for maintaining a sound, uniform national currency, and for the safe collection of revenue. Here is another power, long used, but now lopped off. And this power, too, thus lopped off from the Constitution, is evidently not within the power of any of the individual States. No State can maintain a National Currency; no State institution can render to the revenue the services performed by a National Institution.

"The principles of the Administration are hostile to Internal Improvements. Here is another power, heretofore exercised in many instances, now denied. The Administration denies the power, except with qualifications, which cast an air of ridicule over the whole subject; being founded on such distinctions as between salt water and fresh water, places above custom houses and places below, and others equally extraordinary.

"Now, Sir, in all these respects, as well as in others, I think the principles of the Administration are at war with the true principles of the Constitution; and that by the zeal and industry which it exerts to support its own principles, it does daily weaken the Constitution, and does put in doubt its long continuance. The inroad of to day opens the way for an easier inroad to-morrow. When any one essential part is rent away, or what is nearer the truth, when many essential parts are rent away, who is there to tell us how long any other part is to remain?"

"Sir, our condition is singularly paradoxical. We have an Administration opposed to the Constitution;—we have an opposition which is the main support of the Government and the Laws. We have an Administration which denies, to the very Government which it administers, powers which it has exercised for forty years; it denies the protecting power, the Bank power and the power of Internal Improvement. The great and leading measures of the National Legislature are all resisted by it. These, strange as it may seem, depend on the Opposition for support. We have, in truth, an Opposition without which it would be difficult for the Government to get along at all.—I appeal to every member of Congress present (I am happy to see many here) to say, what would now become of the Government, if all the members of the Opposition were withdrawn from Congress. For myself, I declare my own conviction that its continuance might probably be very short. Take away the Opposition from Congress, and let us see what would probably be done the first session! The Tariff would be entirely repealed. Every enactment having protection by duties as its main object would be struck from the statute book. This would be the first thing done. Every work of Internal Improvement would be stopped—this would follow as matter of course. The Bank would go down, and a Treasury money agency would take its place. The Judiciary act of 1789 would be repealed, so that the Supreme Court should exercise no power of revision over State decisions. And who would resist the doctrines of Nullification? Look, sir, to the votes of Congress for the last three years, and you will see that each of these things would, in all human probability, take place at the next session, if the Opposition were to be withdrawn. The Constitution is threatened, therefore, imminently threatened, by the very fact, that those are entrusted with its administration who are hostile to its essential powers."

But now Mr. Webster is seeking not only to restore all these powers, with the virtual acknowledgment that they will increase executive power, but is endeavoring in his opposition to the Sub-Treasury to connect the Government with all the Banking Institutions of the country and thereby to extend its influence over them—yet Mr. Webster complains that the executive patronage has increased, is increasing, and ought to be di-

minished.—The truth is, Mr. Webster well knows that the patronage of the President will be enhanced an hundred fold by the exercise of these powers, and therefore so far from a disposition to weaken the executive, he advocates those measures to increase that patronage which he, in fact, believes too small to hold the Government together.—Hence the ingenious sophistries and gross misrepresentations we have endeavored to expose.

In another part of his speech, Mr. Webster undertakes to show that Mr. Van Buren is hostile to State Rights. What an anomaly does this effort exhibit to the American People? Daniel Webster, the Federalist and advocate of Hamilton's system of Government, labouring to prove Mr. Van Buren hostile to State Rights! Will wonders never cease? We will not waste ink and paper in refuting so preposterous a pretension.

Mr. Webster, in his late speech in this City, as well as the one at Saratoga, and at Suffolk, descended to the merest tricks and the grossest misrepresentations—we have heretofore exposed his facts and arguments on the Sub-Treasury, as found in his speech at Saratoga. In his speech here the other day, by way of sustaining himself at Suffolk, where he said, "words were not things, professions were not principles, and that fair words, butler no parsnips," he used the following language:

"I say then, that the enemy has been driven to his last citadel. He takes to himself a popular name, while beneath its cover he fires all his abuse upon his adversaries. That seems to be chief mode of warfare. If you ask him what are his pretensions to the honors and the confidence of the country, his answer is, 'I am a Democrat.' But are you not in arms against Mr. Poinsett's bill? The answer still is, 'I am a Democrat, and support all the measures of this Democratic Administration.' Yes, but what is that? 'I am a Democrat.' But do you approve of the turning out of the members from New Jersey? 'Oh yes, because the words are written on our banner (words actually placed on one of the Administration flags in a procession in Ohio.) 'Democracy scorns the Broad Seal of New Jersey.'"

Here Mr. Webster endeavors to make the impression, that the Democratic party had taken to themselves their cognomen for the purpose of hiding the deformity of their principles. Mr. Webster knew as well as any man, that this distinctive appellation had from our earliest history belonged to those who advocated certain fixed principles of Government. It was originally given to the firm friends of popular rights in our early history by their Federal opponents as a term of reproach, and was regarded opprobrious until the principles they advocated became canonized by Thomas Jefferson. It is a name which they bore with pride and exultation throughout the Administration of the Elder Adams, when bitter persecution was a certain consequence of the declaration, "I am a Democrat." They fought under that name—suffered pains, penalties and forfeitures for it—elected Thomas Jefferson under it, infused their principles into his Administration, and have ever since been known by it in or out of power—yet Mr. Webster at this late day comes to Virginia and taunts the friends of Jefferson with taking to themselves a popular name, as a cover for their abuse of that very Federalism which enacted against it in 1800, a Sedition Law, and under which its advocates were fined and imprisoned. If it be true that names alone possess such magic influence over the public mind, how happened it, that Federalism, in the days of the Elder Adams, which was then "all the go," did not retain its power over the public mind? The reason is very obvious; because the principles it put forth were of the most revolting character to the freemen of this country. How happens it that no name which the Federal party has since assumed, has not possessed this influence? Because their principles have not changed, and the people have understanding to perceive it. Yes, Democratic friends, we have earned the title of "Democrats," and well do we deserve it. We will not basely, and for sinister purposes, like the Webster Federalists, change it for another, or another, and another, as they have done, and disgrace each, in succession, as they have been known by them. If we err, we err honestly, and will correct the error.—We will not know the wrong, and still the wrong pursuing, change our name to practise a fraud and imposition upon our fellow-citizens.

But, Mr. Webster calls himself, or rather wishes to be known as a Jeffersonian Democrat.—This, it is true, is an unanswerable commentary on his opinion of the influence of names. But does he suppose that there is a single Democrat in the United States who can believe he is Democrat, because he calls himself so? No; they will not believe him. Before Mr. Webster can be admitted into the Democratic fold, he must change all his political principles—his very nature even, so deeply imbued is he with the anti-Democratic principle.

Again, if names have such power, why has not Mr. Webster and his friends been able long ago to pros-

trate the Democratic party? Have they not been called by all manner of hard names—such as Loco Focos, Agrarians, Infidels, Jacobins, Fanny Wright men, and so on?

Again, our opponents, ever since 1834, have been known by a name rendered dear to millions by association with the sacred cause of liberty, as contended for in the Revolutionary War, and yet they have not been able to fool the people by a name, and God grant they never may.—The truth is, names are nothing—principles every thing, and the people have understood this, whether they will understand the meaning of log cabins, hard cider, 'coon skins, flags, banners, and a hundred lies suddenly endorsed by a thousand witnesses before the character of the testimony can be examined into, remains to be seen.

We have been always taught, from our infancy, that to earn a good name as an inheritance for those who are to come after us, was the first duty which man owes to himself, family and society. Mr. Webster's argument furnishes advice of an opposite character, or rather takes away all stimulus to earn a good name, since after earning it, it is to be a reproach to him who earned it, and is to be taken away; but it is the office of Federalism to filch from others that which does not belong to them; and hence Mr. Webster ridicules the pretensions of the Democracy to their name, and kindly takes it to himself.

The residue of the extract is a master piece of disingenuousness, want of candor, and unfairness: it is neither argument, nor assertion. Such taunting comes with a very ill grace from a supporter of Gen. Harrison—a man who has no one fixed principle, or so many that no two persons can understand him alike—a candidate pledged to make no declarations for the public eye—in the keeping of a committee—and whom Mr. Webster himself did not defend or say what were his principles—a mum candidate, who answers neither friends nor foes, and when his principles are asked for, log cabins and hard cider is the reply.—Mr. Webster supporting such a man and taunting us as Democrats—standing too as he was at the very time on a platform decorated with badges, flags, and devices, and surrounded as he was with a badged multitude, innumerable banners, and a log cabin on wheels, containing a negro with coon skins, broom straw, and cat tails, hanging around about it—"Oh! what a sight was there, my countrymen!" yet the great Daniel Webster himself, practising in every sense of the word, a gross deception on Virginia, comes here to taunt us with our Democracy!

This distinguished leader of the Whig party said also in his speech, delivered here on the 5th inst. at the great Whig Convention, that though he had a sanguine temperament, yet he confessed that if Mr. Van Buren could not be removed through the ballot box in November, the future was full of darkness and of doubt. This sentiment, taken in connection with the reasons which he assigned for the great assemblages which every where had taken place of the Whigs throughout the Union for the first time since the Revolution, and for his coming five hundred miles from home and appearing for the first time before Virginians as a political teacher, and the gratuitous assumption which he made, that the Democratic party had maintained the ascendancy for a long time through the power and influence of Executive patronage against a decisive majority of the people of the U. S., inculcates as plainly as language can inculcate, a resort to arms and bloody revolution in the event of a failure to turn out Mr. Van Buren. True, Mr. Webster, in another part of his speech, to cover up this threat, invokes for his party a spirit of moderation and persuasion towards their political opponents, with a view to their opposing Mr. Van Buren; but not one word does he say of submission to their will, in case they out-number them at the polls. This old-fashioned Federalist, who opposed the war, a righteous war with England, declared by the administration of Madison, to shield our sailors from impressment and vindicate the honor of the nation, comes before a Virginia audience, now that sailors' rights are defended, and the honor, liberty, and prosperity of the country acknowledged by all the world, but a few desperate politicians, to make the people believe their liberties and honor are in danger, and that they should shed each other's blood in maintaining them. Had Mr. Webster evinced more patriotism during the war, or had he served his country then in the defence of her violated rights, or even had he not embarrassed her movements against the enemy, he might, in consideration of his great comprehension of intellect and powers, as a speaker, have expected at least that his counsels would have been entitled to some respect and influence among his fellow-citizens; but when it is remembered that he never has been a champion in his country's cause, when even engaged with a foreign foe, how can he expect to command the patriotic sensibilities of those who live in the land of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Henry and Wythe, whose names he profaned on the portico of the Capitol, where once their eloquence thundered in behalf of liberty?

But Mr. Webster need not come to Richmond to threaten Virginians, how ingeniously soever he may

plaster over his threats—They have comprehension enough to understand them whether openly or covertly made, and firmness to treat them for what they are worth. Virginians know that the truly courageous and determined never make threats, but always adhere to their purpose. It is an old saying that "a barking dog seldom bites," and true of Mr. Webster, if any one, looking at history when he said all were "LIARS" who called him "Aristocrat," and cowards if they would not come in reach of his right arm. Truly this Mr. Webster all at once must be a very hotspur of a fellow.—Where was his courage when war raged in our borders? Surprising indeed, that this enviable quality has not then manifested itself, seeing that he possesses it in such a high degree in his old age—This conduct of Mr. Webster more than any thing else satisfies us that he was determined to lay aside the dignity of the statesman, and all regard for principle, and act the demagogue for selfish purposes.

In conclusion, it is worthy of especial consideration, that neither he nor the Whig Address which has proceeded from the late humbug affair, on the 5th here, has bestowed one single word upon those measures of Government, which have for the last 10 years marked the distinction between the Whig and Democratic parties. This is a virtual abandonment of all principle, and proof positive that a reliance has been placed on violence, misrepresentation, flattery and humbuggery to bamboozle the people of the U. States.

WHIGGERY AND ABOLITIONISM STRUCK HANDS! NORWICH, Conn., Oct. 5, 1840.

Dear Sir: Two years ago the coming spring, when the Abolition fever raged to a very great extent in this city, and when it was supposed that it would be impossible to blend it with either of the two great political parties, a vote was passed at a town meeting, that the Abolitionists should not have permission to assemble in the Town Hall for the purpose of discussing their incendiary doctrines. That vote has stood recorded upon the town journals until the present time. To-day we have had our annual town election, and the Federalists being in a majority of nearly 200 votes, it was thought a proper time to conciliate the favor of the Abolitionists by rescinding the vote against them. The Abolitionists were clamorous in their denunciations against the Administration party, and declared that they would support Harrison only on condition of a repeal of the vote. A prominent Whig and a virulent Abolitionist, John Breed, the Mayor of the city, made a motion to rescind the vote, and it was carried by an overwhelming majority, all the Administration men voting against the repeal, and the Whigs almost to a man voting in the affirmative.

Why was this vote taken at this particular time, just upon the eve of the Presidential election? The question is easily answered. Harrison was nominated as the Abolition candidate, and of course every barrier that had existed between the Federalists and Abolitionists must be broken down, so that they might go into the coming contest with the utmost union and harmony.—This has now been done here, and indeed throughout New England. Here, an Abolitionist who is now a Democrat is as rare an animal as a white black bird, while every Abolitionist is a notorious Federalist and a decided supporter of Harrison.

Will the Democracy of the South stand by their brethren of the North, who are exerting every effort in their power to put down these fanatical disturbers of the domestic institutions of the slaveholding States?

We are preparing a document in answer to a base lie, furnished by Noyes Barber to B. W. Leigh, who is now retailing it through your State, in relation to our Groton celebration, published in the Petersburg paper.—There were no negroes there, except white ones, and they were Whigs.

P. S. Since the above was written, I have received the document referred to, and herewith transmit a copy, asking of you the favor to see that the Democratic paper at Petersburg copies it.

NOYES BARBER—BASE FALSEHOODS.

The Petersburg Intelligencer (a Virginia paper) contains the two following letters written by Noyes Barber of Groton, and were read by B. W. Leigh, at a Whig meeting in Southampton, Virginia.

(Here follow the two letters copied from the N. Y. Evening Post, published in a preceding column.)

A virulent slander, a more unblushing falsehood was never uttered. We, the undersigned citizens of New London county, Connecticut, were present at the Convention at Groton Heights, on the 5th of September last, and were eye witnesses of all that took place on that occasion, and with full knowledge of all the facts, we pronounce the above statements of Noyes Barber to be wholly and absolutely false. Among the thousands who were present, it is not improbable that some of the black servants from the steamboats then lying at the wharves, might have been seen on shore during the day; and if the writer of the above letters attempts to justify his statements from that circumstance, it will only add to the infamy of his falsehood, by furnishing evidence of the deliberate malice with which it was uttered. The charge that "They (the procession) marched from

this place to the sacred spot with negroes in their ranks," is as deliberate a falsehood as the most abandoned villain ever uttered.

AVERY DOWNER,

President of the Convention.

GAD. S. GILBERT, Secretary.

ASA CHILD.

ENOCH C. CHAPMAN,

JACOB W. KINNEY.

The New London Gazette of the 7th, contains further certificates, signed by 34 citizens of Groton, and by 82 citizens of New London, certifying that Noyes Barber was a "Liar," for having asserted that negroes were intermixed in the procession.—*Enquirer.*

The Threats of the Whigs—Revolution, Anor!

That there is a settled purpose on foot with many of the leaders in behalf of a monarchical Government to resort to force, in case Mr. Van Buren should be re-elected, admits of little doubt. At all times, whether the Government is properly or wickedly administered, obscure men of desperate fortunes are sometimes met with, who long for violent changes, as a means of bettering their condition. Our country, unfortunately, has not been exempt from such characters, but the day has arrived in this free and enlightened Republic, when we see the most prominent men, from the positions they occupy before the country, openly proclaiming, in the presence of large masses of their fellow-citizens, the most revolutionary, disorganizing and treasonable sentiments. A cause which requires to be upheld by such means, is unworthy the support of freemen—such desperation and madness cannot be consistent with the rights of the people or the philosophy of self-government. The Whig candidate himself has not been able to control his indiscretion. He has been among the first to throw out the insinuation that force will be justifiable, if they should fail at the polls. Hear him in his Speech at Fort Meigs:

"Now, fellow-citizens, I have very little more to say, except to exhort you to go on, peacefully, if you can, and you can, to effect that reform upon which your hearts are fixed. What calamitous consequences will ensue to the world, if you fail. If you should fail, how the tyrants of Europe will rejoice. If you fail, how will the friends of freedom, scattered like the few planets of Heaven over the world, mourn, when they see the beacon light of liberty extinguished—the light whose rays they had hoped would yet penetrate the whole benighted world."

He says, "peacefully, if you can." He does not add, to be sure, "forcibly, if you must." But he says "you can," and proceeds to calculate the cost of a failure in a way to impress it on the minds of his party.

What says Mr. Bell of Tennessee? Hear him!

"The appeal is one to reason. No feelings but those of patriotism, love of justice, and equal rights, need be invoked as yet; though the day may come, when a scene of injury and oppression—of indignation for a country's institutions dishonored and overthrown, may call forth deeper passions, and awaken different energies. That time, I hope, may not come; but, if it should, I shall be ready to do my duty then as now."

What says Mr. Preston of South Carolina?

"If Mr. Van Buren was not defeated at the ballot boxes, by constitutional means, he for one was willing to resort to the rights and the arms that Nature gave him."

What says Mr. Graves of Kentucky, at Charlestown, Virginia?

"If I were not for the hope of redress, the hope of a change through the ballot-box, I would here, as help me God, upon this body armor, take an oath this night, to take up arms and march with you to Washington, and put down the present Dynasty by force."

What said Capt. Stockton of New Jersey at Vincennes?

"That they must rally to beat the Democrats, peacefully if they could, but *force* if they must. He told them to drive back the brigades. He said 'with the Scotsman of old, you may cry—they have robbed us of name, and pursued us with beggary; and would to God I might hear roaring from the ranks of the Democratic Whigs of New Jersey, the concluding part of that stanza, viz:—'Give them roof to the flames, and their flesh to the eagles.'"

This Speech is published in the Federal papers of N. Jersey, with remarks of JOY and APPROPRIATION, so that it becomes the language of the entire party, and not of this man only.

What said another of their Hotspurs, before the people of Ulster county, N. Y.?

"Fellowmen of Ulster county—persevere in the work you have commenced—go on for Harrison and Reform—and, if the ballot box does not produce reform, blood will flow—the sword of freedom will be unsheathed—the tyrants will be laid prostrate at our feet."

What said Allen Trimble of Ohio, Whig Ex-Governor?

"But I have yielded to the solicitations of a couple of gentlemen who sat near me, to get up and show myself to you; to let you know, that I am with you, heart and hand, in this struggle for liberty—and, gentlemen, if we cannot succeed at the ballot-box, we shall have to resort to our last resource at the point of the bayonet, and I will be with you on all occasions."

In speaking of the broad seal men, Mr. Southard exclaimed:

"That seal was made in blood, and he for one said, it should be redeemed in blood, if in no other way."

Mr. Profit proclaimed the design in the following declaration, made in the House of Representatives:

"If the Administration must go down, and if by revolution, it must go down." "If I had a son, I would train him up to arms, and point to him the purpose."

And, what says the Richmond Whig, the organ of the great Whig party in the State of Virginia; and a paper which has done its share in bringing about the present state of violence in the country? Hear him in his paper of Aug. 31:

"It is equally certain, that the discontents of the American people cannot be appeased, except by a change of those rulers. Every

day beholds this conviction gaining ground, that something is 'rotten in Denmark,' taking more extensive hold on the minds of the people, and popular excitement becoming more intense and determined. So high and so vehement runs the patriotic fervor, that in some contingencies which it is needless to particularize, the rejection of Mr. Van Buren would lead the experienced and observing mind to apprehend popular commotions and tumults. These contingencies cannot occur, because Mr. Van Buren cannot be elected, and it is well for the peace, as well as the happiness and honor of the country, that he cannot."

This article evidently embodies a threat, though it alludes to "contingencies" happening after his election. What these "contingencies" can be, it will require a Solomon to tell. If Mr. Van Buren should be re-elected, and we cannot doubt that he will be—an event, which, in some "contingencies," would lead the Whig "to apprehend popular commotions," &c.—would the "patriotic fervor" of the Whig be so "vehement" as to appeal to arms? If so, where is the difference between the Whig's "patriotic fervor" and TREASON?

STAND TO YOUR ARMS, Democratic friends, as we have before admonished you. Be not COAXED or THREATENED into the embrace of such a violent party. Let them bluster, swear and menace, but FEAR THEM NOT! For the sake of freedom, virtue, yourselves, families and country, KEEP THEM OUT OF POWER. In a tone of lofty defiance, tell them to their teeth, "strike me, if you dare, and if you dare, you die!"

The Yeoman seeks to make the impression on its readers, that Mr. Van Buren has "libelled" the character of Gen. Washington, in his letter to some citizens of Kentucky. The Yeoman ought to know better than this. Mr. Van Buren does not mention the name of Gen. Washington, or even allude to his administration, in that letter; yet the Yeoman seizes upon a passage containing a denunciation of the old system of deposits, as an attack upon the character of Gen. Washington! Was Gen. Washington the friend of the old system? We ask the question, was he? Dare the Yeoman "libel" the character of that great man, by saying he was? He was not. The Sub-Treasury system was the system of Washington.—He approved a bill authorizing the collection of the public monies in gold and silver, and its custody by individual officers, in 1796. He presided over the Convention which formed the present Constitution, and saw enough at least to make him so far question the power of Congress to create a Bank, as to ask for the opinions of Jefferson and Hamilton on the subject. Nothing but the disasters of the country, which had grown out of the Revolution, induced him, it is believed, to incline favorably to the opinion of Hamilton, the advocate of a Bank. Hamilton is emphatically the founder of the paper system in this country—Gen. Washington was averse to it. Will the Yeoman read his letter to Mr. Stone, written the 25th day of February, 1797?

"I do not scruple to declare, that if I had a voice in your Legislature, it would have been given decidedly against a paper currency, upon the general principles of its utility as a Representative, and the necessity of it as a medium."

"To assign reasons for this would be as unnecessary as tedious. The ground has been so often trod, that a place hardly remains untouched. In a word, the necessity arising from the want of specie is represented as greater than it really is. I contend that it is by the substance, not with a shadow of a thing, we are to be benefited. The wisdom of a man, in my humble opinion, cannot at this time devise a plan by which the credit of our paper money would be long supported; consequently, depreciation keeps pace with the quantity of the emission, and articles for which it is exchanged rise in a greater ratio than the sinking value of the money. Wherein, then, is the farmer, the planter, the artisan, benefited? The debtor may be, because, as I have observed, he gives the shadow in lieu of the substance, and, in proportion to his gain, the creditor or the body politic suffers. Whether it be a legal tender or not, it will as has been observed very truly, leave no alternative. It must be that or nothing. An evil equally great! The door it opens immediately for speculation, by which the best designing, and perhaps the most valuable part of the community are preyed upon by the more knowing and crafty speculators."

Yet, in the face of this unequivocal declaration by Gen. Washington, the Yeoman attempts to fix a "libel" on Mr. Van Buren, by first "libelling" the Father of his Country, in an attempt to identify him with the present suspended banks of the country, to all of which, he declares nearly hostility, even in their most acceptable condition, when they pay specie.

The Whig and Officeholders.

The organ of the Opposition in this city has been filled of late with rancorous abuse of Andrew Tucker, Daniel and officeholders generally, for expressing opinions favorable to the Administration, Listen to the whining by posture, on the interference of State officeholder Morgan, here, in opposition to Mr. Van Buren:

"Col. C. S. Morgan of Richmond, a native of the county of Monticello, and transferred from the Senate of Virginia to the respectable station of Superintendent of Penitentiary, has addressed an able letter to a Committee at Wheeling, in reply to an invitation to the great gathering in that city on the 2d September. We very sincerely regret that our limits will not allow us to place the whole of Col. Morgan's letter before the public. We are obliged to limit ourselves to the concluding portion. We need not say, that Col. Morgan is one of those who, preferring Country to Party, has disengaged himself from Van Burenism."

This man comes forward to abuse the Independent Treasury and bolster up a rotten credit system, just on the eve of an important Presidential election. We suppose he is preparing in time to calculate the mad spirit of proscription, which he fears the tools of Harrison are preparing to pour out upon him and others who dare to maintain a fearless, independent position. He makes at least the profound and very liberal concession, that both the candidates are "Democratic Republicans." Democratic Republicans! Can the man be beside himself? Has he read the papers, or has he been asleep, and Rip Van Winkle like, just waked up! Democratic Republicans both! No two men in the nation could have been selected as candidates for the Presidency of more opposite and differing principles. Harrison is a Federalist, and acknowledged the same to

John Randolph as late as 1836. He has been proved to be one by Mills, by Fowler, by Price, by Osborne, by Caldwell, and by others. He supported the Alien and Sedition Law administration of John Adams. He spoke against reducing his Standing Army at a time when his insolent soldiery were insulting and maltreating the Democracy for raising liberty poles in behalf of Jefferson. He is the friend of a Bank, and has been the uniform advocate of a Tariff and Internal Improvements. He supported the younger Adams in all his high-handed claims for power. He has supported all the intriguing schemes of the present Whig party, and Crittenden's bill, akin to, if not worse than, the principle of the Sedition Law. He is in favor of selling and whipping white men and women. His prominent friends are now suspected to be in alliance with foreign money-mongers, to impose a tax and burden on the industrial pursuits of the people of this country to benefit the rich nabobs of England. He a Democratic Republican! Verily, Mr. Officeholder, the tenure by which you hold your office must be as brittle as a thread. On the contrary, there is no one point in which Mr. Van Buren and Gen. Harrison have acted on principle and preference together, either as to "men or measures," as Randolph said to the latter in 1836. Yet both are "Democratic Republicans"—a curious mode of arriving at conclusions. They have arrived at the same point by pursuing opposite directions. We suppose it is on the principle of the earth's rotundity, or the great ball in Baltimore—perhaps "log cabins and hard cider." What a party of coonskins!

Harrison in favor of making Militia Arm themselves, and Firing them if they do not do so.

It will be remembered, that great alarm was excited in the public mind, on account of that feature in the bill of Mr. Poinsett for disciplining the militia, which requires the militia to furnish their own arms. This requirement was nothing new; for, it was but a copy almost word for word and comma for comma, of the existing law. It was not enough to satisfy the complaints of the enemies of the Administration, for they still persisted in misrepresenting the fact, and exciting all the alarm it was possible to do. It made no difference, that the President disapproved the provision, or that Gen. Harrison still approved a similar one, precisely as found in his report of 1817-18, as Chairman of the Military Committee in Congress. All would not do; but the President, though innocent, must be hunted down at all events. We have come across another reminiscence, which places in striking contrast this provision of Mr. Poinsett's bill with Gen. Harrison's views upon the subject.—Mr. Poinsett, and likewise the President, instead of recommending a penalty on the militia, for not furnishing the arms required in the bill, recommended depots of arms as a means of saving them the expense; but Gen. Harrison not only required them to furnish their own arms, but would have been in favor of fining them, as a means of compelling them to do so. The following proceedings took place in the Senate of Ohio, the 5th of February, 1836:

SENATE MAY 5, 1836.

"The Senate, according to the order of the day, resolved itself into a committee of the whole Senate, upon the bill to amend the act for disciplining the militia; and after some time spent therein, the Speaker resumed the Chair, and Mr. Foss reported, that the committee had, according to order, said bill under consideration, had made some amendments thereto, which he presented at the Clerk's table.

"Said amendments being taken up, were agreed to.

"Whereupon,

"Mr. Cole moved to amend said bill further, by inserting the following as a new section:

"Sec. 5. *Be it further enacted*, That a fine shall not be assessed upon any person who may hereafter attend any regimental or company muster without a gun; provided such person shall make it appear upon oath or affirmation, to the satisfaction of the commanding officer of his company, that he does not possess a gun of his own.

"Which motion was decided in the negative—yeas 15, noes 16.

"Harrison in the negative.

"On motion that said bill be engrossed with amendments and read a third time on Monday next, it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 19, noes 16.—Harrison in the affirmative."

[Ohio Senate Journal, page 256.]

What honest man, who has made use of this "Standing Army" humbug, will not blush for the injustice he has done Mr. Van Buren.—As he comes to take a calm and dispassionate view of the subject, there is good cause to apprehend from the elevation of Gen. Harrison a Standing Army, because he made a speech in favor of one, during the administration of Mr. Adams. There can be no such fear, if Mr. Van Buren be re-elected. On the contrary, there is a positive assurance, so far as the President is concerned, that no such plan with the details as recommended by Mr. Poinsett, will receive his sanction. *Choose ye between them!*

If a "cabin" full of Whigs can eat "a bushel of corn," and guzzle a barrel of "hard cider," how much of each could all the Whigs in the U. S. and England make "disappear"? May be "honest John Davis' wife" can tell.

The following, from the Whig of this city, will show whose friends the negroes are, and whom, by parity, they support for the Presidency:

"A Good 'Un.—A negro was recently riding along one of the streets in F—, when his horse made a blunder, and was near coming down sprawling in the dirt, throwing his rider over his head. Hastily regaining his feet, and finding himself uninjured, he began kicking and cuffing the poor beast, cursing him at the same time. At last, having exhausted his vocabulary, he bawled out, 'You damned Loco Foco!' Some gentlemen, who had been spectators of the scene, enquired of him why he called his horse a Loco Foco. 'Why, massa,' said he, 'he got two good eyes in his head, and dey was hoof open, and dare lay de ting right in he way, and he wouldnt see it.'"

Let the Whigs no longer deny that they have the Abolitionists on their side, since the negroes have come out to aid them abuse the Loco Focos.

Virginia Erect!

Let other States "shoot madly from their spheres," this proud, "unterrified Commonwealth" will stand erect, true to herself, true to the South, true to her "natural allies, the Democracy of the North;" true to her own illustrious principles, and true to the Union. What though Maryland may appear to waver! What though Georgia may seem to turn her back upon the great principles of the Constitution, and to her dearest rights, and to all Southern institutions. What though they may for a moment seem to join the unholy coalition of Federalism and Abolitionism—What, though they may incur the fearful responsibility of encouraging those fell spirits, who are attempting to undermine our institutions, and break in upon the sanctity of our hearths, and the security of our families—yet, this good old State, will rouse up her lion spirit with redoubled energy, and muster all her forces for the conflict of the 2nd of Nov. We fought in 1836 without the aid of Georgia or of Maryland. The former went against us by a majority of 2,772—and Maryland cooperated with the Whigs by a majority of 3,684—What then! We fought and we conquered then—we shall again fight with all our energies—and with the assistance of other allies, which we were not fortunate enough to possess in 1836—with the aid of Tennessee, which then went for White by near 10,000 majority—perhaps of Ohio, which went against us by more than 8000 majority—we can win the victory, and save ourselves from a monstrous Bank, an oppressive Tariff, a wild and extravagant system of Internal Improvements, the prostration of all our great constitutional principles, and the fell spirit of Abolitionism.—Strike the flag of Virginia! Never—Never was her destiny brighter than it is now. Never were the prospects of success more encouraging. We neither despair of Maryland, nor of Georgia—and the Democracy of North Carolina are nobly exerting themselves to redeem that gallant State. We cannot but believe and hope, that they will all yet come to the rescue. The Elections which have just transpired will teach us and our friends the danger of overweening security, and the necessity of greater exertions. The result will only rouse their blood up, if they have hearts in their bosoms, which are worthy of their country and her cause. The Democrats of Maine are setting them the example of the loftiest energy—So is North Carolina—and the generous spirits of Maryland and of Georgia will bestir themselves to greater efforts. They will work in season and out of season. They will strain every nerve in the short time that is allowed to them, (fortunately N. Carolina has greater scope and longer time, as her election does not take place till the 19th of November)—They will now do every thing to redeem their respective States. They will stand by the Democracy of the North, and their distinguished candidate, "the Northern man with Southern feelings."—But if after all, they should be defeated, what then? Shall we despond? Never. Shall we ask quarter from an enemy, who can owe his victory only to our rankest enemies; the infuriated and pestilential Abolitionists? NEVER, NEVER. We will look to other quarters for generous and gallant allies.—We will look to the Keystone State, and to the Empire State.—We will look to Ohio, and Michigan, and Illinois, and Missouri; to Mississippi and Alabama; to Arkansas; to Tennessee and to South Carolina; to New Hampshire and to Maine, and with their aid, we will attempt to save the Administration from the grasp of a feeble and intriguing candidate, and his mongrel, and Federal managers, who will be "the power behind the throne greater than the throne itself."

Republicans of Virginia—let us do our duty, and all will be well. Never have we felt so proud of the name of a Virginian, as when we trace these lines. You once saved your country, when she was writhing in the Anacanda folds of the Adams "Reign of Terror." Your immortal Resolutions and Report of '99, have since constituted the Shibboleth of the Republican faith—the Pillar of fire by night, and the cloud by day. You maintained your principles ever since—and though, or a time they were elsewhere eclipsed, by the heresies of the latitudinous constructionists, the parasites of a Bank, and the champions of the Protective system, and the foul brood which Federalism has engendered, yet we again triumphed, with the assistance of that man of iron-nerve, Andrew Jackson.—What does he now tell us? Hear the last warning voice of this distinguished patriot.—[We omit the introductory Correspondence, which called out the following letter—as we find it in the Ulster (N. Y.) Republican. It states, that whilst at Kingston, in Ulster, on the 26th August, Gov. Call of Florida, who has taken the field against Mr. Van Buren, announced himself to have been the confidential aid of Gen. Jackson at the battle of N. Orleans, &c., &c.]

HERMITAGE, September 22, 1840.
Sir—Your letter of the 7th instant, inclosing me a copy of the preamble and resolution of the Democratic Association of Kingston, Ulster county, New York, of which you are President, is just received.

The resolution is as follows: "Resolved, That the Chairman and Secretaries of this association be requested to write to his Excellency General Andrew Jackson, and ask him whether the said General Call, [referring to the preamble to said resolution,] was really his confidential aid in that battle, [the battle of the 8th of January, 1815.]

The above inquiry I answer—that General Call was not one of my aids-de-camp, at that time. They were Major John Reid, and Capt. Thomas L. Butler, of the United States army; my volunteer aids were Edward Livingston, Esq., Abner L. Duncan, Esq., Mr. Duplaisis, then Marshal of the State of Louisiana. General Call never became one of my aids, until 1818, when he continued with me as such until I retired from the Army in 1821.

As to the rumor, to which you allude, of my attachment to Gen. Harrison, and aiding now to elect him President of these United States, it is without the least shadow of truth. Gen. Harrison and myself have through a long life, been antipodes in politics, and he is among the last men, of any public note, that I would support for the Presidency of this great and rising Republic.—It is my serious belief, that if General Harrison should be elected President, it will tend to the destruction of our glorious Union, and Republican system.

I write with great difficulty, therefore it is, that I have not copied into this letter the preamble to the resolution, referring to it only.

I am very respectfully yours,

ANDREW JACKSON.

LEVI E. VANDERLYN, Esq., President of the Association, Kingston, Ulster county, N. Y.

Andrew Jackson has sounded the alarm, and the sagacity of his character is such as commands our respect to his predictions. The South is in danger—and so is the Union. Touch the slaves of the District, and the Union is gone like flax before the flames. Open the door constantly to those petitions, and W. H. Harrison tacitly admits their right, and his right hand minister, Daniel Webster, has attempted to vote down every resolution which would seal the lips of the petitioners, and a flood of debate, and a flame of agitation would come upon us, which are directly calculated to sweep away, and to consume the very pillars of our Union.

Impressed with these solemn convictions, we will not cease to sound the alarm in every region of the South, and still to call upon Georgia, upon Maryland, upon chivalrous North Carolina, to come to the rescue—and to stand by the Northern Democracy, who have stood by us. But if, as still we do not expect now they will be so blind to their own interests as to desert us, Virginia will occupy a position in the Union, which the proudest patriot may envy. Unawed and immovable, she will still battle for her State Rights principles, and for Southern Rights. She will again become the flag-bearer—and with sinewy arms, with a bold and buoyant heart, she will bear it aloft, until she will again arouse her sister States, and save the Constitution from the profanation of Federalists and the treachery of Apostates. If others should desert us, it only forms the stronger necessity for our standing fast, putting forth all our strength, to save the Citadel itself.—We call then upon every Virginian, upon every man who values State Rights and Southern Institutions, to exert every nerve, to march to the polls, to carry every Democrat with him, to save the State. What a proud character! what a noble wreath will entwine the brow of the venerable mother of States and of Statesmen, when other States may be shooting madly from their spheres, SHE should stand like her own mountains—fixed, unshaken, immovable! With the fixedness of purpose which she will thus display; with the moral power which she will thus acquire again—she will be respected, while feared by her enemies—honored and trusted by her friends.—She will come forth to the rescue, as she did in '99—again she will become the standard-bearer, and every noble heart will rally to her support.

Let us then put forth all our strength on the second of November. We have it in our power to re-elect Martin Van Buren. He will be re-elected, in spite of the premature braggadocias, if the Republican States of the Union do their duty. Even if we should lose Georgia and Maryland, what then? They were against us in 1836. If North Carolina, who votes last of all in the campaign, should not right herself—though we have the strongest assurances of her success—yet we shall have an equivalent for her vote in Tennessee, which was against us in 1836. Ohio was also then against us; and we may now have her with us.—Notwithstanding these drawbacks in 1836, Mr. Van Buren was elected by a triumphant majority.—We shall then enjoy the same fortune now, if our friends do their duty. We shall thus dissipate the vapors of the Whigs into thin air. Courage, then, friends. Cheerily, cheerily—Go to work with a bold hand and buoyant heart. Let each State vote for itself, and each man act for himself, independent of all these, as if the election depended upon herself or upon himself. Thus only can we do right; and thus only ascertain the fair majority of the votes. Thus, we shall carry Martin Van Buren. But even if we fail in that great object, a higher destiny awaits us. We shall hereafter save the Union from the Abolitionists. We shall save the country from a monstrous monied power. We shall put down the Federal Webster dynasty which threatens to usurp the seat of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Jackson. To arms then! to arms, gallant Democrats of Virginia.

Georgia—is for the present gone to the Opposition. In 62 out of 93 counties, the Whig majority for Congress is about 5,448—the same counties last year giving them a majority of 1,262. The most of the remaining counties to come in, are Democratic, and will reduce the Whig majority.—But we do not give up the ship in Georgia.—Our friends are determined to put forth their whole strength, and strain every nerve, and redeem the State in November. We will never believe it until we see it, that Georgia will be found warring against Southern Rights and Institutions, by consorting with Northern Whigs and Abolitionists.